APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,572	07/21/2003	Seiji Takahashi	240620US2	4804

22850	7590	02/02/2006	EXAMINER

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

		EXAMINER
		CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 July 2006 and 16 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/21/2003 et al.*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to Application filed on 07/21/2003.

2.   Claims 1-34 are pending.

3.   Foreign Priority was claimed and all certified foreign applications JP 2002-212300

(07/22/2002), JP 2002-242548 (08/22/2002) and JP 2002-242550 (08/22/2002) were received

and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming
> the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims 6, 8, 10-13, and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "said display information generating part" in line 12. There

is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "said display information generating part" in line 2. There

is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 10 recites the limitations "the other Web information" in line 4 and "the other Web information generating parts" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 11 recites the limitations "said display information generating part" in line 2 and "said Web information generating part" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitations "said display information generating part" in line 2 and "said Web information generating part" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "said Web information generating part" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 21 recites the limitation "said display information generating part" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "said other Web information generating part" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 23 recites the limitations "said display information generating part" in line 2, "the

Web information generating part" in line 5, and "the other Web information generating part" in

line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 24 recites the limitations "the other Web information" in line 4 and "said other

Web information generating parts" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these

limitations in the claim.

Claim 25 recites the limitations "the other Web information" in line 4 and "said other

Web information generating parts" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these

limitations in the claim.

Claim 26 recites the limitations "said other Web information generating part" in line 4

and "Web Frame information generating part" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis

for these limitations in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another
filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an
application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent,

except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7.   Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14-19, 21-25, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Watson et al. (Publication No US 2004/0049574).

        As to claim 1, Watson et al. teach:

"An information processing apparatus connectable to a terminal through a network" (see [0046]),

said information processing apparatus comprising:

"a reference Web information generating part specifying a terminal type of the terminal

based on a first request requesting Web information, said first request sent from the terminal

through the network, and generating reference Web information that includes a reference path

created by adding terminal type information showing the specified terminal type to a path

indicated in the first request for accessing the Web information and that allows the terminal to

automatically accesses to the reference path" (see [0047], [0051] and [0055] wherein the

collaboration of the device identification engine and the code generating engine is equivalent to

Applicant's "reference Web information generating part", in which the device identification

engine identifies the device type from received messages wherein device type is equivalent to

Applicant's "terminal type" and received message is equivalent to Applicant's "first request",

and the code generating engine generates web page code document wherein web page code

document is equivalent to Applicant's "reference Web information"; and the disclosure of

hierarchical structure of device type (see [0093]-[0096]) and determining from the URL the

appropriate information as disclosed in [0053] implies a reference path as illustrated in

Applicant's claim language; also see [0133] wherein path including device type identifier in the

URL is equivalent to Applicant's "reference path"); and

"a communicating part sending the reference Web information to the terminal as a

response with respect to the first request, and receiving a second request for requesting the Web

information specified by the reference path" (see [0053] and [0055] wherein the front end

processor is equivalent to Applicant's "communicating part", response messages are equivalent

to Applicant's "reference Web information, and user device is equivalent to Applicant's

"terminal"; and see [0170] wherein the way to respond to subsequent request from the user

device as disclosed indicates that second request for requesting the Web information must be

specified by the reference path as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"when said communicating part receives the first request from the network, said

communicating part additionally provides a default value of the terminal type and reference Web

information identification for identifying said reference Web information generating part to the

path for the Web information in the first request" (see [0053]-[0055] wherein front end processor

is equivalent to Applicant's "communicating part", web application processor is also equivalent

to Applicant's "reference Web information generating part", and the disclosure that the front end

processor send URL information to a web application processor wherein web application

processor outputs a document comprising instructions for generating web page code as disclosed implies that a default value of the terminal type as well as Web ID as illustration in Applicant's claim language must be provided in order to access to web application processor), and

"said reference Web information generating part is executed by the reference Web information identification additionally provided by the communicating part and replaces the default value with the specified terminal type" (see [0053]-[0056] wherein front end processor is equivalent to Applicant's "communicating part", web application processor and code generating engine are equivalent to Applicant's "reference Web information generating part"; and the disclosure that document generated by the web application processor is not capable of being interpreted by a browser of a user device, and document generated by the code generating engine is capable of being interpreted by the browser of the user device wherein user device type is equivalent to Applicant's "terminal type" implies that default value provided for web application processor must be replaced by a specified device type, as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; also see [0093]).

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"wherein said communicating part generates the reference path by adding the default value before Web identification for identifying the Web information in the path for the Web information indicated in the first request" (see [0093] and [0105] wherein URL request must

have default value before the web information identification in order for web application to

identify the request web page and select appropriate document of content code as disclosed).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"a Web information generating part generating the Web information" (see [0054]

wherein web application processor is equivalent to Applicant's "Web information generating

part", and "document comprising instructions for generating web page code" is equivalent to

Applicant's "Web information"); and

" a display information generating part generating a Web page by describing the Web

information corresponding to the terminal in a display format for displaying the Web information

at the terminal based on terminal type information obtained from the reference path indicated by

the second request" (see [0055], [0056] and [0133] wherein "code generating engine" is

equivalent to Applicant's "display information generating part", and "web page code document"

is equivalent to Applicant's "Web page"; also see [0065]).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"a plurality of other Web information generating parts generating other Web information

other than the Web information, said other Web information linked from the Web information by

a relative path wherein when one of the other Web information generating part corresponding to

the other web information generates the other Web information in response to a third request for

requesting the other Web information selected by a user at the terminal displaying the Web

information, said display information generating part generates the Web page for displaying the

other Web information suitable for the terminal at the terminal, based on the terminal type

information set in the reference path" (see [0110], [0123]-[0128] wherein "production server",

"probe site", and "service centre" are equivalent to Applicant's "a plurality of other Web

information generating parts", in which production server generates web page information

[0110], probe site generates a probe [0123] and service centre generates temporary update

message wherein web page information, probe and temporary update message are equivalent to

Applicant's "other Web information", and the disclosure of how to process request messages

from a user device is equivalent to Applicant's claim language; also see tag "anchor" in Table 5

for the capability to link web information by relative path as illustrated in Applicant's claim

language).

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 6,

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"a Web frame information generating part setting relative paths for the Web information

and the other information to display for each of a plurality of frames, and generating Web frame

information defining the plurality of frames to divide the Web page" (see [0073]-[0076] and Fig.

5A-C wherein "panes" is equivalent to Applicant's "frames" and layout for the web page as

disclosed implies the inclusion of functions equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "Web frame information

generating part"),

"wherein said reference Web information generating part generates the reference web

information that includes the reference path to access the Web frame information created by

adding terminal type information to a path for the Web frame information and that allows the

terminal to automatically access to the reference path" (see [0073]-[0077] and [0135] wherein

the disclose of difference displays for different device type and the disclosure of querying a static

web page for a device type ID and URL imply the inclusion of reference web information as

illustrated in <u>Applicant</u>'s claim language), and

"when said communicating part sends the reference Web information to the terminal as

response to the first request and receives the second request requesting the Web frame

information by the reference path from the terminal, said Web frame information generating part

is executed" (see [0053], [0062], [0073], [0086] and Table 5 wherein "front end processor" is

equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "communicating part", "code appropriate to the device type" is

equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "reference Web information, and the disclosure of display including

number of panes wherein panes is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "frames" implies the inclusion of

Web frame information generating part; also the disclosure of tag "anchor", which links to

another canvas, page or section, implies the request by the reference path from the terminal as

illustrated in <u>Applicant</u>'s claim language).

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 7,

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"wherein said display information generating part disable the Web frame information

generating part based on the terminal type information obtained from the reference path

indicated in the second request, and generate the Web page that allows the terminal to directly

access the Web information by a relative path for the Web information requested by the first

request" (see e.g., [0073] and [0077] disclose that the layout for a web page include multiple

panes on a Web page("panes" is equivalent to Applicant's "frames") when displaying on a PC or

TV screen or PDA, but same document is displayed on WAP telephone as including single pane

decks, which implies the Web frame information generating part must be disabled based on the

terminal type information, and single pane decks as disclosed allowed the terminal to directly

access the Web information by a relative path as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; also

see [0160]).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 6

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"an image forming part forming an image" (see [0060] wherein the disclosure of images

indicates the existence of an image forming part as illustrated in Applicant's claim language";

"an image formation controlling part controlling said image forming part" (see [0060]

and [0065] wherein the disclosure of rendering the image in user devices of different screen

shape and size implies the inclusion of controlling part as illustrated in Applicant's claim

language),

"wherein at least one of said Web information generating part and said other Web

information generating part obtains information concerning said image forming part from said

image controlling part and generating the Web information based on the obtained information"

(see [0060] wherein "code generating engine" is equivalent to Applicant's "Web information

generating part", and "knowledge of the form of image data compression" is equivalent to

Applicant's "information concerning said image forming part...").

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 6

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"wherein said display information generating part generates the Web page displaying the

Web information or the other Web information generated by said Web information generating

part or said other Web information generating parts, in a font size suitable for the terminal, based

on the terminal type information set based on the reference path in common" (see [0062], [0063]

and [0055] wherein "code generating engine" is equivalent to Applicant's "display information

generating part"; see [0133] wherein "device type identifier" is equivalent to Applicant's

"terminal type information" and path including device type identifier in the URL is equivalent to

Applicant's "reference path").

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 6

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"wherein said display information generating part generates the Web page displaying the

Web information or the other Web information generated by said Web information generating

part or said other Web information generating parts, by a number of letters suitable for the

terminal, based on the terminal type information set based on the reference path in common" (see

[0073], [0077] and [0133] wherein code generating engine or dynamic web page server is

equivalent to Applicant's "display information generating part", a path in the URL including

device type identifier wherein device type identifier is equivalent to Applicant's "terminal type

information" is equivalent to Applicant's "reference path", and the disclosure of displaying

information as a single web page or a set of fragments is equivalent to generating the Web page

by a number of letters suitable for the terminal as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

        As to claim 14, Watson et al. teach:

"An information processing method" (see [0046]), comprising the steps of:

        "specifying a terminal type of a terminal connected through a network based on a first

request requesting Web information, said first request sent from the terminal through the

network, and generating reference Web information that includes a reference path created by

adding terminal type information showing the specified terminal type to a path indicated in the

first request for accessing the Web information and that allows the terminal automatically

accesses to the reference path" (see [0047], [0051] and [0055] in which the device identification

engine identifies the device type from received messages wherein device type is equivalent to

Applicant's "terminal type" and received message is equivalent to Applicant's "first request",

and the code generating engine generates web page code document wherein web page code

document is equivalent to Applicant's "reference Web information"; also see [0133] wherein

path including device type identifier in the URL is equivalent to Applicant's "reference path");

and

"sending the reference Web information to the terminal as a response with respect to the

first request, and receiving a second request for requesting the Web information specified by the

reference path" (see [0053] and [0055] wherein response messages are equivalent to Applicant's

"reference Web information, and user device is equivalent to Applicant's "terminal"; see [0128]

wherein temporary update message which contains a device identifier is equivalent to

Applicant's "second request"; also see [0133] wherein path including device type identifier in

the URL is equivalent to Applicant's "reference path").

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"generating the Web information" (see [0054] wherein "document comprising

instructions for generating web information code" is equivalent to Applicant's "Web

information");

"generating a Web page by describing the Web information corresponding to the terminal

in a display format for displaying the Web information at the terminal based on the terminal type

information obtained from the reference path indicated by the second request" (see [0055]

wherein web page code document is equivalent to Applicant's "Web page", and user device is

equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "terminal", and see [0133] wherein a path in URL including device

type identifier is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "reference path").

        As to claim 16, <u>Watson et al.</u> teach:

"An information processing apparatus connectable to a terminal through a network" (see [0046]),

said information processing apparatus comprising:

        "a reference Web information generating part specifying a language used at the terminal

based on a first request requesting Web information, said first request sent from the terminal

through the network, and generating reference Web information that includes a reference path

created by adding language information showing the specified language to a path indicated in the

first request for accessing the Web information and that allows the terminal to automatically

accesses the reference path" (see [0047], [0055] and [0166] wherein the code generating engine

is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "reference Web information generating part", the disclosure of

language identifier as input to the code generating engine in addition to the device ID wherein

device is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "terminal" implies a language used at the terminal is specified

by a reference Web information generating part as illustrated in <u>Applicant</u>'s claim language , and

the code generating engine generates web page code document wherein web page code

document is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "reference Web information"; and see [0133] wherein

path including device type identifier and the language identifier [0166] in the URL is equivalent

to <u>Applicant</u>'s "reference path")

        "a communicating part sending the reference Web information to the terminal as a

response with respect to the first request, and receiving a second request for requesting the Web

information specified by the reference path" (see [0053] and [0055] wherein the front end

processor is equivalent to Applicant's "communicating part", response messages are equivalent

to Applicant's "reference Web information", and user device is equivalent to Applicant's

"terminal"; see [0170] wherein the way to respond to subsequent request from the user device as

disclosed indicates that second request for requesting the Web information must be specified by

the reference path as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"when said communicating part receives the first request from the network, said

communicating part additionally provides a default value of the language and reference Web

information identification for identifying said reference Web information generating part to the

path for the Web information in the first request" (see [0053]-[0055] wherein front end processor

is equivalent to Applicant's "communicating part", web application processor including code

generating engine is also equivalent to Applicant's "reference Web information generating part",

and the disclosure that the front end processor send URL information to a web application

processor wherein web application processor outputs a document comprising instructions for

generating web page code as disclosed implies that a default value of the language as well as

Web ID as illustration in Applicant's claim language must be provided in order to access to web

application processor), and

"said reference Web information generating part is executed by the reference Web

information identification additionally provided by the communicating part and replaces the

default value with the specified language" (see [0053]-[0056] and [0166] wherein front end

processor is equivalent to Applicant's "communicating part", web application processor and

code generating engine are equivalent to Applicant's "reference Web information generating

part"; and in order to respond to a user preference as disclosed [0166], default value provided for

web application processor must be replaced by a specified language, as illustrated in Applicant's

claim language).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

17 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"wherein said communicating part generates the reference path by adding the default

value before Web identification for identifying the Web information in the path for the Web

information indicated in the first request" (see [0093] and [0105] wherein URL request must

have default value before the web information identification in order for web application to

identify the request web page and select appropriate document of content code as disclosed).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"a Web information generating part generating the Web information" (see [0054]

wherein web application processor is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "Web information generating

part", and "document comprising instructions for generating web page code" is equivalent to

<u>Applicant</u>'s "Web information"); and

" a display information generating part generating a Web page by describing the Web

information corresponding to the terminal in a display format for displaying the Web information

at the terminal based on language information obtained from the reference path indicated by the

second request" (see [0055], [0056], [0133], [0163] and [0166] wherein "code generating

engine" is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "display information generating part", and "web page code

document" is equivalent to <u>Applicant</u>'s "Web page").

As to claim 21, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

<u>Watson et al.</u> teach:

"a plurality of other Web information generating parts generating other Web information

other than the Web information, said other Web information linked from the Web information by

a relative path wherein when one of the other Web information generating part corresponding to

the other web information generates the other Web information in response to a third request for

requesting the other Web information selected by a user at the terminal displaying the Web

information, said display information generating part generates the Web page for displaying the

other Web information suitable for the terminal at the terminal, based on the language

information set in the reference path" (see [0110], [0123]-[0128] and [0166] wherein

"production server", "probe site", and "service centre" are equivalent to Applicant's "a plurality

of other Web information generating parts", in which production server generates web page

information [0110], probe site generates a probe [0123] and service centre generates temporary

update message wherein web page information, probe and temporary update message are

equivalent to Applicant's "other Web information", and the disclosure of how to process request

messages from a user device is equivalent to Applicant's claim language; also see tag "anchor"

in Table 5 for the capability to link web information by relative path as illustrated in Applicant's

claim language).

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

19 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"an image forming part forming an image" (see [0060] wherein the disclosure of images

indicates the existence of an image forming part as illustrated in Applicant's claim language";

"an image formation controlling part controlling said image forming part" (see [0060]

and [0065] wherein the disclosure of rendering the image in user devices of different screen

shape and size implies the inclusion of controlling part as illustrated in Applicant's claim

language),

"wherein at least one of said Web information generating part and said other Web

information generating part obtains information concerning said image forming part from said

image controlling part and generating the Web information based on the obtained information"

(see [0060] wherein "code generating engine" is equivalent to Applicant's "Web information

generating part", and "knowledge of the form of image data compression" is equivalent to

Applicant's "information concerning said image forming part...").

As to claim 23, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. as modified teach:

"wherein said display information generating part generates the Web page by additionally

providing an image to the Web information or the other Web information generated by the Web

information generating part or the other Web information generating parts, based on the language

information set based on the reference path in common" (see [0060], [0065] and [0166] wherein

"code generating engine" is equivalent to Applicant's "display information generating part", and

"Web page code" is equivalent to Applicant's "Web information").

As to claim 24, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

19 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"wherein said display information generating part generates the Web page displaying the

Web information or the other Web information generated by said Web information generating

part or said other Web information generating parts, in a font size suitable for the terminal, based

on the language information set based on the reference path in common" (see [0062], [0063],

[0166] and [0055] wherein "code generating engine" is equivalent to Applicant's "display

information generating part"; see [0133] and [0166] wherein "device type identifier" is

equivalent to Applicant's "terminal type information", language identifier is equivalent to

Applicant's "language information", and path including device type identifier and language

identifier in the URL is equivalent to Applicant's "reference path").

As to claim 25, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

19 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"wherein said display information generating part generates the Web page displaying the

Web information or the other Web information generated by said Web information generating

part or said other Web information generating parts, by a number of letters suitable for the

terminal, based on the language information set based on the reference path in common" (see

[0073], [0077], [0133] and [0166] wherein code generating engine or dynamic web page server

is equivalent to Applicant's "display information generating part", a path in the URL including

device type identifier and language identifier ([0133] and [0166]) is equivalent to Applicant's

"reference path", and the disclosure of displaying information as a single web page or a set of

fragments is equivalent to generating the Web page by a number of letters suitable for the

terminal as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; also see [0167] and [0168]).

As to claim 27, Watson et al. teach:

"An information processing method" (see [0046]), comprising the steps of:

"specifying a language used at the terminal connected through a network based on a first

request requesting Web information, said first request sent from the terminal through the

network, and generating reference Web information that includes a reference path created by

adding language information showing the specified language to a path indicated in the first

request for accessing the Web information and that allows the terminal to automatically accesses

the reference path" (see [0047], [0055], [0163] and [0166] wherein the disclosure of language

identifier as input to the code generating engine in addition to the device ID wherein device is

equivalent to Applicant's "terminal" implies a language used at the terminal is specified as

illustrated in Applicant's claim language , and the code generating engine generates web page

code document wherein web page code document is equivalent to Applicant's "reference Web

information"; and see [0133] wherein path including device type identifier and the language

identifier [0166] in the URL is equivalent to Applicant's "reference path")

"sending the reference Web information to the terminal as a response with respect to the

first request, and receiving a second request for requesting the Web information specified by the

reference path" (see [0053] and [0055] wherein response messages are equivalent to Applicant's

"reference Web information", and see [0170] wherein the way to respond to subsequent request

from the user device as disclosed indicates that second request for requesting the Web

information must be specified by the reference path as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 28, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

27 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. teach:

"generating the Web information" (see [0054] wherein "document comprising

instructions for generating web information code" is equivalent to Applicant's "Web

information");

"generating a Web page by describing the Web information corresponding to the terminal

in a display format for displaying the Web information at the terminal based on the language

information obtained from the reference path indicated by the second request" (see [0055],

[0163] and [0166] wherein web page code document is equivalent to Applicant's "Web page",

and user device is equivalent to Applicant's "terminal", and see [0133] and [0166] wherein a

path in URL including device type identifier and language identifier is equivalent to Applicant's

"reference path").

8.   Claims 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen et al.

(Publication No US 2003/0020746).

        As to claim 29, Chen et al. teach:

"An information processing apparatus connectable to a terminal through a network" (see [0046],

said information processing apparatus comprising:

"a profile reference Web information generating part specifying a profile requested by a

profile change requesting to change the profile with respect to Web information displayed at the

terminal, said profile change request sent from the terminal through the network, and generating

profile reference Web information that includes a profile reference path created by setting profile

information showing the specified profile to a path for accessing Web information and that

allows the terminal to automatically accesses to the profile reference path" (see [0034],][0106],

[0109] and [0042] wherein the use of user's preference profile from the service provider registry

and the ability for user profile management as disclosed implies the inclusion of a profile

reference Web information generating part and ability to change the profile and generate profile

reference Web information as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; see [0033] and [0040]

for generating Web information according to user preference which is equivalent to Applicant's

"profile reference Web information"; and see [0105] wherein "reference to a node" is equivalent

to Applicant's "profile reference path");

"a communicating part sending the profile reference Web information to the terminal as a

response with respect to the profile change request, and receiving an auto-accessed request for

requesting the Web information suitable for the profile by the profile reference path" (see [0101],

[0116] and [0120] wherein the disclosure of a system able to send requested web page and

receive request implies the inclusion of a communicating part as illustrated in Applicant's claim

language and the disclosure of that both users requested the same URL of Web Server but each

received a different display according to each user's identity is equivalent to Applicant's "auto-

accessed request by the profile reference path");); and

"an authenticating part authenticating the user of the terminal when the auto-accessed

request is received and allowing to provide the Web information suitable for the profile indicated

in the profile reference path based on an authentication result" (see [0053], [0102], [0108] and

[0109] wherein GUI data manager is equivalent to Applicant's "authenticating part").

As to claim 30, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 29 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Chen et al. teach:

"a Web information generating part generating the Web information" (see [0028] and [0029] wherein application integration bus is equivalent to Applicant's "Web information generating part"); and

"a display information generating part generating a Web page by describing the Web information corresponding to the terminal in a display format for displaying the Web information at the terminal based on the profile information obtained from the profile reference path indicated by the auto-accessed request" (see [0033]-[0036] wherein GUI data manager is equivalent to Applicant's "display information generating part"; see [0105] where the process of parsing the URL into node information as disclosed implies the auto-accessed request and profile reference path as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 31, this claim is rejected based on argument given above for rejected claim 30 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Chen et al. teach:

"an XML describing part describing the Web information generated by said Web information generating part and the profile information in an extensible markup language" (see [0031] wherein "data format translator" is equivalent to Applicant's "XML describing part"); and

"an HTML converting part generating the Web page by converting the Web information

described in the extensible markup language into a hypertext markup language in accordance

with a style sheet corresponding to the Web information based on profile information" (see

[0034] and [0035] wherein "GUI data manager" is equivalent to Applicant's "HTML converting

part" and "XSL file" is equivalent to Applicant's "style sheet").

As to claim 32, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

31 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Chen et al. teach:

"a plurality of other Web information generating part generating other Web information

other than the Web information, said other Web information linked from the Web information by

a relative path" (see [0028] and [0037] wherein the disclosure of information generated from a

variety of disparate sources implies the inclusion of a plurality of other Web information

generating part as illustrated in Applicant's claim language),

" wherein when one of the other Web information generating part corresponding to the

other Web information generates the other Web information in response to a next request for

requesting the other Web information selected by the user at the terminal displaying the Web

information, said display information generating part generates the Web page for displaying the

other Web information suitable for the terminal at the terminal, based on the profile information

set in the profile reference path" (see [0037], [0034]-[0036], and [0040] wherein each of "variety

of sources" is equivalent to Applicant's "one of the other Web information generating part",

"GUI data manager" is equivalent to Applicant's "display information generating part", and the

disclosure that the GUI data manager responds to requests by generating Web pages based on

data from a variety of source depending on user request is equivalent to Applicant's claim

language).

As to claim 33, Chen et al. teach:

"An information processing method" (see [0025]), comprising the steps of:

"specifying a profile requested by a profile change requesting to change the profile with

respect to Web information displayed at the terminal, said profile change request sent from the

terminal through the network, and generating profile reference Web information that includes a

profile reference path created by setting profile information showing the specified profile to a

path for accessing Web information and that allows the terminal to automatically accesses to the

profile reference path" (see [0034],][0106], [0109] and [0042] wherein the use of user's

preference profile from the service provider registry and the ability for user profile management

as disclosed implies ability to change the profile and generate profile reference Web information

as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; see [0033] and [0040] for generating Web

information according to user preference wherein "Web information according to user

preference" is equivalent to Applicant's "profile reference Web information"; and see [0105]

wherein "reference to a node" is equivalent to Applicant's "profile reference path");

"sending the profile reference Web information to the terminal as a response with respect

to the profile change request, and receiving an auto-accessed request for requesting the Web

information suitable for the profile by the profile reference path" (see [0101], [0116] and [0120]

wherein the disclosure of a system able to send requested web page and receive request implies

the inclusion of a communicating part as illustrated in Applicant's claim language and the

disclosure of that both users requested the same URL of Web Server but each received a

different display according to each user's identity is equivalent to Applicant's "auto-accessed

request by the profile reference path"); and

"authenticating the user of the terminal when the auto-accessed request is received and

allowing to provide the Web information suitable for the profile indicated in the profile reference

path based on an authentication result" (see [0053], [0102], [0108] and [0109] wherein the

disclosure of determining the credentials of the user to see if the user is authorized to access is

equivalent to Applicant's "authenticating the user").

As to claim 34, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim

33 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Chen et al. teach:

"generating the Web information" (see [0037]); and

"generating a Web page by describing the Web information corresponding to the terminal

in a display format for displaying the Web information at the terminal based on the profile

information obtained from the profile reference path indicated by the auto-accessed request" (see

[0033]-[0037] and [0105] where the process of parsing the URL into node information as

disclosed implies the auto-accessed request and profile reference path as illustrated in

Applicant's claim language).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claims 13 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watson

et al. (Publication No US 2004/0049574).

As to claims 13 and 26, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for

rejected claims 7 and 20 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. do not teach "said reference Web information generating part, said Web

information generating part, said other Web information generating part, and Web frame

information generating part are programs developed by C language".

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Watson et al. by implementing the invention of Watson et

al. using C language instead of JAVA as disclosed (see [0047] and [0195]) because programs

written in C language are easily adapted to new environments since C language is a dominant

language in systems and microcomputer applications programming.

11.   Claims 5, 10, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Watson et al. (Publication No US 2004/0049574) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in

view of Chen et al. (Publication No US 2003/0020746).

       As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 4

and are similarly rejected including the following:

       Watson et al. do not teach "an XML describing part describing the web information

generated by said Web information generating part and the terminal type information in an

extensible markup language"; and

       "an HTML converting part generating the Web page by converting the Web information

described in the extensive markup language into a hypertext markup language in accordance

with a style sheet corresponding to the Web information based on the terminal type information"

       Chen et al. teach "an XML describing part describing the Web information generated by

said Web information generating part and the terminal type information in an extensible markup

language" (see Chen et al., [0033] and [0035], and Watson et al., [0006], [0055] and [0063]); and

       "an HTML converting part generating the Web page by converting the Web information

described in the extensible markup language into a hypertext markup language in accordance

with a style sheet corresponding to the Web information based on the terminal type information"

(see Chen et al., [0035]-[0037] wherein XSL file is equivalent to Applicant's "style sheet", and

see Watson et al., [0055] and [0063]).

       It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Watson et al. by the teaching of Chen et al.,

because adding an XML describing part describing the Web information generated by said Web

information generating part and the terminal type information in an extensible markup language

provides an effective way to integrate Web data from a variety of sources since XML is a

uniform language suitable for representing information (see Chen et al., [0023] and [0033]), and

adding an HTML converting part generating the Web page by converting the Web information

described in the extensible markup language into a hypertext markup language in accordance

with a style sheet corresponding to the Web information based on the terminal type information

provides an effective way for representing information to a user since HTML format is a format

suitable for representation to a user (see Chen et al., [0035], and Watson et al., [0061]).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 5

and is similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. as modified teach:

"wherein said display information generating part generates the Web page by additionally

providing an image to the Web information or the other Web information generated by the Web

information generating part or the other Web information generating parts, based on the terminal

type information set based on the reference path in common" (see [0060], [0065] and [0133]

wherein "code generating engine" is equivalent to Applicant's "display information generating

part", "web page code" is equivalent to Applicant's "Web information", and "user device" is

equivalent to Applicant's "terminal").

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 19 and are similarly rejected including the following:

Watson et al. do not teach "an XML describing part describing the web information generated by said Web information generating part and the language information in an extensible markup language"; and

"an HTML converting part generating the Web page by converting the Web information described in the extensive markup language into a hypertext markup language in accordance with a style sheet corresponding to the Web information based on the language information"

Chen et al. teach "an XML describing part describing the Web information generated by said Web information generating part and the language information in an extensible markup language" (see Chen et al., [0033] and [0035], and Watson et al., [0006], [0055], [0163], [0166] and [0063]); and

"an HTML converting part generating the Web page by converting the Web information described in the extensible markup language into a hypertext markup language in accordance with a style sheet corresponding to the Web information based on the terminal type information" (see Chen et al., [0035]-[0037] wherein XSL file is equivalent to Applicant's "style sheet", and see Watson et al., [0055], [0163], [0166] and [0063]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Watson et al. by the teaching of Chen et al., because adding an XML describing part describing the Web information generated by said Web information generating part and the language information in an extensible markup language provides an effective way to integrate Web data from a variety of sources since XML is a

uniform language suitable for representing information (see <u>Chen et al.</u>, [0023] and [0033]), and

adding an HTML converting part generating the Web page by converting the Web information

described in the extensible markup language into a hypertext markup language in accordance

with a style sheet corresponding to the Web information based on the language information

provides an effective way for representing information to a user according to a user preference of

language since HTML format is a format suitable for representation to a user (see <u>Chen et al.</u>,

[0035], and <u>Watson et al.</u>, [0061]).

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to <u>Applicant</u>'s

disclosure.

<u>Himmel</u> (US Patent No 6,167,441) teaches customized Internet content is provided to a

requesting client device based on the capabilities of the requesting client device.

<u>Hishida et al.</u> (US Patent No 6,477,549) teach a transmission document device edits a

transmission document to be transmitted to a variety of mobile communication terminal from a

document described in a markup language.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PTC

January 26, 2006

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167